

A
FILE SUBJ.
DATE SUB-CAT.
7/69

VIETNAM COURIER ANALYZES NIXON'S WAR POLICY

Hanoi in English to Southeast Asia 1000 GMT 10 Jul 69 B

[Text] We now bring you an article from the VIETNAM COURIER entitled "Mr Nixon's Useless Search for Similarity."

Everyone knows that the U.S. imperialists have long been coveting Vietnam, and that United States colluding with the French colonialists in the 1945-54 dirty war had the unavowed aim of eventually supplanting the latter. But when North Vietnam was completely liberated, they concentrated their colonialist efforts on the south, cast out the Frenchmen from there, and (?set) up their rule by the agency of a government on their payroll.

Faced with the resistance of South Vietnam popular and patriotic forces, they dispatched their troops there and went to the length of expanding their aggression to the north. To cover these doings, which were bluntly cynical, they cooked up the North Vietnam aggression against the south (?clique). On the strength of this fabrication, the U.S. bullies are now refusing to withdraw simply and fully their accursed troops from South Vietnam whose pullout would immediately help to restore peace.

They want any troop withdrawal from South Vietnam to be mutual. The National Front for Liberation, proceeding from the principle of respect for the Vietnamese people's national rights, including the right to resist foreign aggression, advocates in its then 10-point overall solution a clear distinction between the problem of U.S. troops, which must be brought home unconditionally, and that of Vietnamese armed forces in South Vietnam, which would be settled by Vietnamese parties concerned. This assertion of the National Front for Liberation (?countered) by both common sense and good will does not reach Washington, which persists in putting on equal footing the aggressors and those who defend themselves against aggression.

Men in the White House are trumpeting that they also respect the South Vietnamese people's right to self-determination. Mr Nixon has on many occasions referred to the latter's free choice, and cried out against any intention of imposing any sort of government upon the people of Vietnam. But, by the point stressed by the American Lawyers' committee for a policy toward Vietnam at the Stockholm emergency action conference on Vietnam, the Thieu-Ky regime, which is a military dictatorship propped up by the U.S. power--despised by most Vietnamese and notoriously corrupt--was imposed upon South Vietnam by the United States, and is maintained in power by American gold. Consequently, the above statement of Mr Nixon was hypocritical to the extreme.

This Thieu-Ky-Huong clique, whose removal is being asked by the South Vietnam popular masses, is obstinately kept in office by Washington, under the pretext that it was the legal and constitutional government of South Vietnam. However, unless Mr Nixon has too short a memory, he should remember that this very legality and constitutionality have been denied by none other than Nguyen Cao Ky, the Saigon vice president, himself, who once spoke in the following terms of the election returning him to power: The elections here have been a loss of time and money. They are a joke. They have served to install a regime that has nothing in common with the people, a useless, corrupt regime.

In his 14 May speech, Mr Nixon mentioned, in ambiguous terms, [words indistinct] elections in South Vietnam could be held under agreed procedures, but also insisted that the South Vietnamese patriots accept private talks with the Thieu-Ky-Huong regime. That meant that he wanted to rule out, in advance, any political settlement unacceptable to this trio of traitors. Everybody realizes the vital importance of this question. Who will exercise South Vietnam? To this question, the National Front for Liberation has provided the most relevant answer. There should be a provisional coalition government resulting from negotiation conducted on the basis of equality, democracy, and mutual respect between political forces representing various popular strata, and political tradition for South Vietnam, including persons who, for political reasons, have had to take up residence abroad, who stand for peace, independence and neutrality.

The National Front for Liberation proposal has been completely slighted by Mr Nixon, whose intention is quite clear: To proceed in achieving U.S. neocolonialism in South Vietnam, through a government more or less under Washington's (?mold). Consequently, orders have been given by the U.S. President on the one hand, and to Mr Cabot Lodge in Paris, who has been exerting himself to demand a mutual troop withdrawal and to support private contacts between Nguyen Van Thieu and the National Front for Liberation, now Provisional Revolutionary Government, there; and on the other, to General Abrams in South Vietnam to apply maximum military pressure, to be used to secure a position of strength for the United States in negotiations and political bargaining.

In his 14 May speech, Mr Nixon defined, as follows, his political [word indistinct] as regards Vietnam: Our fighting men are not going to be worn down, our negotiators are not going to be talked down, our allies are not going to be let down. This formula is perhaps the most faithful reflection of the three-point essence of Mr Nixon's obduracy in the battlefield, at the Paris conference, and in Saigon. It is difficult to reconcile this doubledealing with an alleged existence of similarity between American and Vietnamese positions, as Mr Cabot Lodge claimed. How then, can he justify the views expressed by Mr Nixon for some [word indistinct] at the Paris conference in a few months to come? Washington has been trying desperately to create an atmosphere of artificial optimism. It has no other aim than reversing a completely hostile public opinion.